

MRS. CATT URGES THE WOMEN TO USE VOTE

Union of Female Forces Makes Possible Accomplishment of Much Good.

PROTECT WOMAN AND CHILD

Ample Money for Suffragists by Bequest of Mrs. Frank Leslie.

NEW YORK. March 15.—More than 12,000,000 women in the United States over 21 years of age will be eligible to vote for the next president in November, when women may go to the polls to an estimation by Miss Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National Woman Suffrage Association and president of the International Suffrage Alliance. This estimate was given in a call on the women voters of the United States to join forces with the National American Woman Suffrage Association at its golden jubilee convention to be held in St. Louis, March 16 to 22. Miss Catt, who has been a suffragist since she was 12 years old, said: "The National Woman Suffrage Association and president of the International Suffrage Alliance."

This estimate was given in a call on the women voters of the United States to join forces with the National American Woman Suffrage Association at its golden jubilee convention to be held in St. Louis, March 16 to 22. Miss Catt, who has been a suffragist since she was 12 years old, said: "The National Woman Suffrage Association and president of the International Suffrage Alliance."

The National American Woman Suffrage Association has invited women voters to a national convention in order that they may organize nationally and unite their forces with those of other lands," said Mrs. Catt.

"There is an obviously important national program for women voters. The great diversity of laws which govern women and children in our several states is a constant menace to the safety and welfare of the unformed and untrained."

The Women Must Agree. The laws of the states could be modified and improvements added even in the states more liberal in their laws if women voters would agree upon a proper constructive program. It is a fact so obvious that it needs no demonstration that if one section of the country is much behind the times in education and legal protection to women and children, its civilization is bound to prove a detriment to the progress of all. Therefore, it becomes the duty of all forward people to see that the laws of the whole nation are unified and that the standard by which to measure the proper program for each state is the code of laws of the most advanced states.

"Women voters should contribute more to their nation and to the world than they do when acting from a localized viewpoint. Those who live in the valley do not know what is to be seen from the mountain top. We must strive to climb the mountains and to look down upon them in our struggle upward toward permanent democratic institutions and consequent permanent peace is here. The opportunity to extend a helping hand to those who are likely to find the path rough and thorny is here. The woman voter with the vision of coming freedom for the race in her soul will not hesitate to offer her service," concluded Mrs. Catt.

Propaganda Well Backed.

The biggest bureau of suffrage propaganda in the world has been organized by Mrs. Catt with funds she was bequeathed by Mrs. Frank Leslie, widow of a widely known statesman and publisher. When Mrs. Leslie died ten years ago she left the bulk of her fortune to Mrs. Catt to be used for the advancement of the suffrage cause. The actual figures are in the neighborhood of \$150,000.

Mrs. Catt, who has an abiding faith that the only reason anybody opposes woman suffrage is because of lack of knowledge of its fundamental significance, decided that the most effective way to advance the suffrage cause was through the furthering of the entire public in the cause of suffrage.

She formed the Little Woman Suffrage Commission, the members of which were to serve under the supervision of the expenditure of the Leslie fund. On the commission are Mrs. Raymond Robbins, president of the National Women's Trade Union League; Mrs. Percy V. Pennington, former president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Miss Mary Garrett Hay, chairman of the woman suffrage party of New York city; Mrs. Arthur Livermore and Mrs. Thomas Thomas Bucklin.

SECRETARY OF STATE SUED UNDER BLUE SKY PROVISION

CHICAGO. March 15.—A \$500,000 suit against Secretary of State Louis E. Marshall was presented today by Joseph Weissbach, attorney for settling stockholders of the Consumers Packing company.

This is the sum Mr. Weissbach claims was lost by his clients, who bought stock in the proposed company, now in the hands of receivers.

Mr. Lamont is headed for Illinois, secretary of state and the time of its kind in this state will determine the extent of his liability in administering the blue sky.

LEAGUE COVENANT DEFENDED BY WEST

CONTINUED FROM PAGE TWELVE THIS SECTION.

Mr. Taft then singles out seven particular instances in which the covenant should be amended. These amendments are suggested as an effort by his acknowledged friend and colleague with the purpose of making the covenant such a one as America should adopt.

Speaking from the same platform with the president at the dramatically arranged meeting in New York, Mr. Taft made in effect the same criticism of the covenant as he does in this newspaper article, but assured us that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. Taft is undoubtedly one of the ablest lawyers and most commanding of men in public life, with a perfect of vision and a remarkable judgment, acquired by a man of the world, and when he is driven to the effect of his own construction as to the effect of the covenant on the constitution and sovereignty of the United States, it will not do to say that he does not understand the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States is in the nature of things compelled to be a party to any war which may break out between any nations of the world, if the covenant is adopted.

Mr. Taft also overlooks another important provision of the covenant affecting the sovereignty of the United States. It is an attribute of sovereignty to enter into binding treaties.

The constitution of the United States expressly declares how treaties are to be made and how they are to be ratified.

It is safe to assume that no sound argument can be advanced in its support. In order to give the assurance that the covenant does not violate the constitution or sovereignty of the United States, it is necessary to provide that neutrals should be protected in the freedom of the seas, if this be true, then it necessarily follows that all members of the league would be parties to the war and engaged in it. So it seems we are safe in asserting that notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Taft, the United States